

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 2, 7-9, 13-14, 16-18, 22-24, 28-29, 31-33 and 37-39 have been currently or previously cancelled, without prejudice.

Claims 1, 3-5, 10-12, 15, 19-21, 25-27, 30, 34-36, and 40-42 remain pending, of which claims 1, 3-5, 10-12, 15, 19-21, 25-26, 30, 34, and 40-41 have been further amended.

### Claims Objections

Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 15, 26, and 30 were objected to for various informalities. Objections against claim 2 have been rendered moot by its cancellation. Claims 1, 10, 11, 15, 26, and 30 have been amended accordingly, overcoming the Examiner's objections.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 15, 17-21, and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Rejections against claims 17-18 have been rendered moot by their cancellations. Claims 15, 19-21, and 25 have been amended to recite articles of manufacture storing the pluralities of programming instructions recited, obviating the Examiner's rejection.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-6, 10-15, 17-21, 25-36, and 40-44 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by the Wireless Markup Language (WML), as described by the "Wireless Application Protocol Wireless Markup Language Specification," dated April 10, 1998 (hereinafter "WML") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 2, 6, 13-14, 17-18, 28-29, 31-33 and 43-44, mooting their rejections, and amended 1, 3-5, 10-12, 15, 19-21, 25-27, 30, 34-36, and 40-42 to overcome the Examiner's rejections. All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure; no new matter has been introduced.

Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite in pertinent part, “each display cell definition defining content of the corresponding display cell, and at least one of the display cell definition having a transition rule defining a next display state of the user interface to transition to, when a user interacts with the content of the display cell.”

Thus, claim 1 is now directed towards a method that requires the employment of display state definitions, each having at least one display cell definition defining not only the content of the display cell, but a transition rule, which defines a transition to be made when a user interacts with the content of the display cell having the rule. In other words, the method requires a display cell definition that integrally defines the content of the display cell as well as the transition, when a user interacts with the defined content.

In contrast, WML teaches a segregated approach. WML employs a dedicated DO element to facilitate user directed navigation. The representation of the DO element is “user agent dependent” (see Sec 9.6 of WML spec). In other words, under WML an end user interface designer is unable to directly associate navigation for user interaction with display content the end user interface designer defines. The user interface designer must specify user directed navigation separately. Further, the user interface designer is unable to control the representation of a DO element. The representation is controlled by the user agent (such as a browser).

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over WML. {Note that other navigation elements such as GO are not for facilitating user directed navigation. For example, in the case of GO, it is for facilitating programming transition in response to execution events.}

Each of independent claims 10, 11, 15, 25, 26, 30, 40 and 41 includes in substance the same recitation requiring a display cell definition with integrated display content and transition rule definition, discussed earlier for claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons, independent claims 10, 11, 15, 25, 26, 30, 40 and 41 are patentable over WML.

Claims 3-5, 12, 19-21, 27, 34-36, and 42 depend on either claim 1, 11, 15, 26, 30, or 41, incorporating their limitations, respectively. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 3-5, 12, 19-21, 27, 34-36, and 42 are patentable over WML.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits remaining claims 1, 3-5, 10-12, 15, 19-21, 25-26, 30, 34, and 40-41 are in condition of allowance. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 381-8819. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: January 3, 2006

by: \_\_\_\_\_



Al AuYeung  
Reg. No.: 35,432

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.  
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97222  
Telephone: 503-222-9981